

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231

| A | PPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | AT | TORNEY DOCKET NO. |
|---|----------------|-------------|----------------------|--------------|-------------------|
| | | | | EX | AMINER |
| | | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | | DATE MAILED: | 8 |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.

Applicant(s)

09/485,245

Hopkins, A

Examiner

CB Wilder

Group Art Unit 1655

| ΧR | Responsive to communication(s) filed on May 11, 2000 | |
|-----------------|---|---|
| T | This action is FINAL . | |
| | Since this application is in condition for allowance except for form accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. | |
| is lor appli | nortened statutory period for response to this action is set to exponger, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to relication to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of CFR 1.136(a). | spond within the period for response will cause the |
| Disp | position of Claims | |
| X | X Claim(s) 1-6 | is/are pending in the application. |
| | Of the above, claim(s) | is/are withdrawn from consideration. |
| | Claim(s) | |
| X | X Claim(s) 1-6 | is/are rejected. |
| | Claim(s) | |
| | Claims | are subject to restriction or election requirement. |
| X Prior X | See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Rev The drawing(s) filed on | by the Examiner. _ isapproveddisapproved. r 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d). priority documents have been national Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). |
| X | X Notice of References Cited, PTO-892 X Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). Interview Summary, PTO-413 Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948 Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152 | 7 |

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Application/Control Number: 09/485,245

Page 2

Art Unit: 1655

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's amendment of claims 2, 4 and 5 in Paper No. 5 has been entered.

Title

2. The title of the invention is not descriptive. a new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed. The instant claims are drawn to compositions comprising random mixtures of oligonucleotides and their use for labeling nucleic acids.

Objections

- 3. The specification and claims are objected to because of the following informalities:
- (a) The word "stabiliser" is misspelled in claim 2 an in the specification at page 3, line 2, page 4, line 1 and page 5, line 1. It is suggested changing "stabiliser" to "stabilizer".
- (b) The word "hybridisation is misspelled in the specification at page 1, line 17. It is suggested changing "hybridisation" to "hybridization".
- (c) The word "lyophilisation is misspelled in the specification at page 4, line 12 and page 10, line
- 12. It is suggested changing "lyophilisation" to "lyophilization"
- (d) The word "visualised" is misspelled in the specification at page 5, line 3. It is suggested changing "visualised" to "visualized".

Application/Control Number: 09/485,245

Page 3

Art Unit: 1655

(e) The word "hybridised is misspelled in the specification at page 10, line 16. It is suggested changing "hybridised" to "hybridized".

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

- 5. Claims 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
- (a) Claim 5 is confusing at "which method comprises" because of improper grammar. It is suggested changing "which" to "wherein the".
- (b) Claim 5 and 6 are indefinite as being incomplete for omitting essential elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the elements. See MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted elements are actual method steps of making labeled probes as per the specification at page 7 and a concluding step resulting in the end product. Clarification is required.
- (c) Claim 6 lacks proper antecedent basis for "the random mixture" because claim 5 does not recite any "random mixtures of oligonucleotides".

Application/Control Number: 09/485,245 Page 4

Art Unit: 1655

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

- (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.
- 7. Claims 1 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Stratagene (January 1997). Regarding claim 1, Stratagene teaches a labeling composition comprising a random mixture of oligonucleotides which are 7 to 8 mers, said composition present in a dry state (page 274, lines 1-5 and section subheading "Linkers" and page 275, section subheading "Adapters").

Regarding claim 4, Stratagene teach wherein the composition is present in a freeze-dried state. (page 274, line 5). Therefore the claimed invention of claims 1 and 4 are anticipated by the reference of Stratagene.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 1655

9. Claims 2, 3, 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stratagene as applied to claims 1 and 4 above in view of Suganuma et al. (Analytical Biochemistry January 20, 1995), and further in view of Shen et al (EP 0 726 310 August 14, 1996). Regarding claim 2, Stratagene teaches a labeling composition which are 7 to 8-mers or greater and wherein the composition is present in a dry state. Suganuma et al. also teach a labeling composition comprising a random mixture of oligonucleotides which are 5 mers to 11 mers (page 605, col. 2, lines 36 and 37). Suganuma et al. teach wherein the composition further comprise a polymerase enzyme, a supply of nucleotides for chain extension, a labeled nucleotide and buffer (page 606, lines 1-10). The composition of Stratagene and Suganuma et al. differ from that of the claimed invention in that the references do not teach wherein a dye and/or stabilizer is added to the composition. In a composition similar to that of Suganuma et al., Shen et al. teach wherein the composition is present in a dry state. Shen et al. also teach wherein the composition comprise a stabilizer along with a polymerase enzyme and a supply of nucleotides for chain extension (page 6, lines 3-7 and 22). Shen et al. do not expressly teach the incorporation of a dye. However, the use of dyes as labeling agents was routinely practiced in the art. It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to add a stabilizer to the composition of Stratagene and Suganuma et al. because the skilled artisan would have been motivated to incorporate a stabilizer to the labeling composition with a reasonable expectation of success by the teaching of Shen et al. that a stabilizing agent prevents or delays the loss of a composition's biological activity as a result of storage over time (page 4, lines 8-10). The skilled

Application/Control Number: 09/485,245

Page 6

Art Unit: 1655

artisan would have been motivated further to add a dye for labeling in view of routine art practice for the obvious benefit of visualizing a polynucleotide generated with the composition.

Regarding claim 3, Suganuma et al. teach, wherein the random mixture is of 6 mer oligonucleotides (page 605, col. 2, lines 36 and 37).

Regarding claim 5, Suganuma et al. in view of Stratagene teach a method of making a labeled probe for a nucleic acid template, wherein the method comprises incubating the nucleic acid template under chain extension conditions with the labeling composition of claim 1 (bottom of page 605, beginning at line 38 to page 606, lines 1 1-11).

Regarding claim 6, Stratagene teach wherein the random mixture of oligonucleotides is present at a concentration of about 1 O.D./ml to 10 O.D./ml (page 274, line 2 and line 29 subheading "Contents").

Conclusion

- 10. No claims are allowed.
- 11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Exr. should be directed to Exr. Cynthia Wilder whose telephone number is (703) 305-1680. The Exr. can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 7:00 am to 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the Exr. by telephone are unsuccessful, the Exr.'s supervisor, W Gary Jones, can be reached at (703) 308-1152. The official fax phone number for the Group is (703) 308-4242. The unofficial fax number is (703) 308-8724.

Art Unit: 1655

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed the Group's receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

Cynthia B. Wilder, Ph.D.

July 14, 2000

S. Extoner